

I truly find it unbelievable that the FCC could allow such a partisan "documentary" to be shown without requiring a counter view. When Reagan ran for office, stations wouldn't show his movies for fear they'd have to provide equal time for his opponents! This was even an issue when George Takei, Mr. Sulu of Star Trek, ran for office! Reagan's movies and Takei's Star Trek role had nothing to do with politics, yet, they were subject to equal time regulations. Now a blatantly partisan political film explicitly made to knock one candidate and to help another can be shown with no opposing view?

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own

communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.